

ON CHISINI'S CONJECTURE. II

VIK. S. KULIKOV

ABSTRACT. It is proved that if $S \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is a smooth projective surface and $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is a generic linear projection branched over a cuspidal curve $B \subset \mathbb{P}^2$, then the surface S is determined uniquely up to an isomorphism of S by the curve B .

Let $B \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be an irreducible plane algebraic curve over $\mathbb{C}$ with ordinary cusps and nodes, as the only singularities. Denote by $2d$ the degree of B , and let g be the genus of its desingularization, c the number of its cusps, and n the number of its nodes. A curve B is called *the discriminant curve of a generic covering of the projective plane* if there exists a finite morphism $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$, $\deg f \geq 3$, satisfying the following conditions:

- (i) S is a non-singular irreducible projective surface;
- (ii) f is unramified over $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus B$;
- (iii) $f^*(B) = 2R + C$, where R is a non-singular irreducible reduced curve and a curve C is reduced;
- (iv) $f|_R : R \rightarrow B$ coincides with the normalization of B .

Such f is called *a generic covering of the projective plane* $\mathbb{P}^2$.

A generic covering $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is called a *generic projection* if the surface S is embedded in some projective space $\mathbb{P}^N$ and $f = \text{pr}|_S$ is a restriction to S of a linear projection $\text{pr} : \mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$.

Chisini's Conjecture (see [2]) claims that if $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is a generic covering of the projective plane of $\deg f \geq 5$ then f is determined uniquely up to an isomorphism of S by its discriminant curve.

It was proved in [4] that Chisini's Conjecture holds for the discriminant curve B of a generic covering $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ if

$$\deg f > \frac{4(3d + g - 1)}{2(3d + g - 1) - c}. \quad (1)$$

Furthermore, it was observed in [6] that, by Bogomolov – Miaoka – Yau inequality, the right side of inequality (1) takes the values less than 12, that is, Chisini's Conjecture holds for the discriminant curves

The work was partially supported by the RFBR (05-01-00455), NWO-RFBR 047.011.2004.026 (RFBR 05-02-89000-NWO_a), INTAS (05-1000008-7805), and by RUM1-2692-MO-05.

of the generic coverings of degree greater than 11. Besides, also it was shown in [6] that if S is a surface of non-general type, then Chisini's Conjecture holds for the discriminant curves of the generic coverings $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ if $\deg f \geq 8$.

The aim of the article is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Let $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be a generic projection. Then the generic covering f is uniquely determined up to an isomorphism of S by its discriminant curve $B \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ except the case when $S \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$ is embedded in $\mathbb{P}^5$ by the polynomials of degree two (the Veronese embedding of $\mathbb{P}^2$ in $\mathbb{P}^5$) and f is the restriction to S of a linear projection $\text{pr} : \mathbb{P}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$.*

Proof. To prove Theorem, we will show that inequality (1) does not hold only for the discriminant curves of two continuous families of generic projections onto the projective plane, and after that we show that for one of these exceptional families, the generic coverings $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ are uniquely determined by their discriminant curves and the generic projections of the second exceptional family are the generic projections of $S \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$ embedded in $\mathbb{P}^5$ by the Veronese embedding.

For this purpose, consider a generic projection $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$, where S is a non-singular surface embedded in $\mathbb{P}^N$. Let $\deg S = m$ be the degree of the embedding $S \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ and $\text{pr} : \mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be a linear projection such that $f = \text{pr}|_S$. We have $\deg f = \deg S = m$.

Any linear projection $\mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is determined by its center $\mathbb{P}^{N-3} \subset \mathbb{P}^N$. Therefore the set of linear projections $\mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is parameterized by the points of the Grassmanian $\text{Gr}(N-3, N)$. Let $u_0 \in \text{Gr}(N-3, N)$ be a point for which the generic covering $f = \text{pr}_{u_0}|_S$ is the restriction of the projection $\text{pr} = \text{pr}_{u_0}$. There is a Zariski open subset U_S of the Grassmanian $\text{Gr}(N-3, N)$ such that for each $u \in U_S$ the restriction f_u of the corresponding linear projection pr_u to S is a generic covering of the projective plane. The set U_S is non-empty, since, by assumption, $u_0 \in U_S$. For $u \in U_S$, the discriminant curves B_u of the generic coverings f_u have the same genus g , the same degree $\deg B_u = 2d$, and the same numbers c and n of the cusps and nodes. Therefore inequality (1) either holds or does not hold simultaneously for all f_u , $u \in U_S$, and, consequently, any point of U_S can be taken as the point u_0 in order to check inequality (1).

By Theorem 3 in [5], there is a non-empty Zariski open subset $V_S \subset \text{Gr}(N-4, N)$ such that for each $v \in V_S$ the image $\bar{S} = \text{pr}_v(S)$ of S under the linear projection $\text{pr}_v : \mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ has only ordinary singular points (that is, singular points given locally by one of the following

equations: $xy = 0$ (a double curve), $xyz = 0$ (a triple point), and $x^2 = y^2z$ (a pinch)).

Consider the flag manifold $F = F(N-4, N-3, N)$ of the linear subspaces $\mathbb{P}^{N-4} \subset \mathbb{P}^{N-3}$ in $\mathbb{P}^N$. We have two natural projections $p_1 : F \rightarrow \text{Gr}(N-3, N)$ and $p_2 : F \rightarrow \text{Gr}(N-4, N)$. Obviously, the intersection $W_S = p_1^{-1}(U_S) \cap p_2^{-1}(V_S)$ of two non-empty Zariski open subsets $p_1^{-1}(U_S)$ and $p_2^{-1}(V_S)$ is a non-empty Zariski open subset of F . Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that the generic covering f coincides with f_u for some $u \in U_S$ for which there is $w \in W_S$ such that $p_1(w) = u$, that is, pr_u can be decomposed into the composition of two projections: the projection $\text{pr}_{p_2(w)}$ and a projection $\overline{\text{pr}} : \mathbb{P}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ such that $\overline{S} = \text{pr}_{p_2(w)}(S)$ is a surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$ of degree $\deg \overline{S} = \deg S$ with ordinary singular points. Denote by $f_1 : S \rightarrow \overline{S}$ the restriction of $\text{pr}_{p_2(w)}$ to S and by $f_2 : \overline{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ the restriction of $\overline{\text{pr}}$ to $\overline{S}$. The morphism f_1 is birational. We have $f = f_2 \circ f_1$.

Denote by $D \subset \overline{S}$ the double curve of $\overline{S}$, $D = D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_u$, where D_i , $i = 1, \dots, u$, are the irreducible components of D . Let g_i and d_i be respectively the genus and the degree of the curve D_i . Put $\overline{g} = \sum_{i=1}^u g_i$

and $\overline{d} = \sum_{i=1}^u d_i$. Denote by t the number of triple points of $\overline{S}$. Note that $0 \leq u \leq \overline{d}$ and $\overline{g} \geq 0$.

We have (see, for example, [3])

$$K_S^2 = m(m-4)^2 - (5m-24)\overline{d} - 4(u-\overline{g}) + 9t, \quad (2)$$

$$e(S) = m^2(m-4) + 6m - (7m-24)\overline{d} - 8(u-\overline{g}) + 15t, \quad (3)$$

where K_S is the canonical class of S and $e(S)$ is its topological Euler characteristic. On the other hand, since $\deg f = \deg S = m$ for a generic projection $f = \text{pr}|_S$, we have (see Lemmas 6 and 7 in [4])

$$K_S^2 = 9m - 9d + g - 1, \quad (4)$$

$$e(S) = 3m + 2(g-1) - c. \quad (5)$$

Lemma 1. *We have*

$$2d = m(m-1) - 2\overline{d}, \quad (6)$$

$$\overline{d} \leq \frac{(m-1)(m-2)}{2}. \quad (7)$$

Proof. Let L be a generic line in $\mathbb{P}^2$ and $\bar{L} = f_2^{-1}(L)$ its preimage. Then $\bar{L}$ is an irreducible plane curve of degree m having $\bar{d}$ nodes as its singular points. Therefore its genus $g(\bar{L})$ is equal to $\frac{(m-1)(m-2)}{2} - \bar{d}$ and inequality (7) follows from the inequality $g(\bar{L}) \geq 0$.

The covering $f_{2|\bar{L}} : \bar{L} \rightarrow L$ is a morphism of degree m and it is branched at $2d = (L, B)_{\mathbb{P}^2} = \deg B$ points. Therefore, by Hurwitz formula, $2g(\bar{L}) - 2 = -2m + 2d$. Thus, we have

$$-2m + 2d = (m-1)(m-2) - 2\bar{d} - 2,$$

that is, $2d = m(m-1) - 2\bar{d}$. $\square$

It follows from equalities (2) – (6) that

$$g - 1 = m \frac{2m^2 - 7m + 5}{2} - 5(m-3)\bar{d} - 4(u - \bar{g}) + 9t, \quad (8)$$

$$c = m(m-1)(m-2) - 3(m-2)\bar{d} + 3t. \quad (9)$$

Substituting equalities (6), (8), and (9) in inequality (1) and performing evident transformations, it is easy to show that inequality (1) is equivalent to the following inequality

$$(m-2)[m(m-1)(m-2) - (7m-24)\bar{d} - 8(u - \bar{g})] + 3(5m-12)t > 0. \quad (10)$$

Therefore, by Theorem 1 in [4], to prove Theorem 1, it suffices to show that if the inequality

$$(m-2)[m(m-1)(m-2) - (7m-24)\bar{d} - 8(u - \bar{g})] + 3(5m-12)t \leq 0 \quad (11)$$

holds for a surface $\bar{S} \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ with ordinary singular points, then either $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is a projection of the projective plane embedded in $\mathbb{P}^5$ by the Veronese embedding or f is uniquely determined up to an isomorphism of S by its discriminant curve B .

By the main result in [6], we can assume that $m \leq 11$.

Lemma 2. *Chisini's Conjecture holds for the discriminant curves of the generic projections $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ if $6 \leq \deg S = m \leq 11$ and $K_S^2 \leq 3e(S)$.*

Proof. It follows from equalities (4), (5), and the inequality $K_S^2 \leq 3e(S)$ that

$$3c \leq 9d + 5(g-1), \quad (12)$$

Assume that Chisini's Conjecture does not hold for the discriminant curve B of a generic projection $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$, $\deg f = \deg S = m$. Then

the invariants of B do not satisfy inequality (1), that is, these invariants satisfy the inequality

$$\frac{4(3d + g - 1)}{2(3d + g - 1) - c} \geq m,$$

or, equivalently,

$$c \geq 2 \frac{(m-2)}{m} (3d + g - 1). \quad (13)$$

It follows from inequalities (12) and (13) that

$$6(m-2)[3d + (g-1)] \leq 3mc \leq m[9d + 5(g-1)]$$

and hence

$$6(m-2)[3d + (g-1)] \leq m[9d + 5(g-1)],$$

that is,

$$g-1 \geq \frac{9(m-4)}{12-m}d \quad (14)$$

(by assumption, $m \leq 11$). Therefore, applying inequality (13), we have

$$c \geq 2 \frac{(m-2)}{m} (3d + g - 1) \geq 2 \frac{(m-2)}{m} \left(3d + \frac{9(m-4)}{12-m}d\right),$$

that is,

$$c \geq \frac{12(m-2)}{12-m}d. \quad (15)$$

Since $\frac{\deg B(\deg B - 3)}{2} = c + n + g - 1$ and $n \geq 0$, then

$$d(2d-3) \geq c + g - 1. \quad (16)$$

Therefore we have

$$d(2d-3) \geq c + g - 1 \geq \frac{12(m-2)}{12-m}d + \frac{9(m-4)}{12-m}d$$

and hence

$$2d-3 \geq \frac{12(m-2)}{12-m} + \frac{9(m-4)}{12-m} = \frac{21m-60}{12-m},$$

that is,

$$d \geq \frac{3(3m-4)}{12-m}. \quad (17)$$

If $m = 11$, then it follows from inequality (17) that $d \geq 87$. On the other hand, by Lemma 1, $d \leq 55$. Contradiction.

If $m = 10$, then it follows from inequality (17) that $d \geq 39$. Therefore, by Lemma 1, we have $\bar{d} \leq 6$.

On the other hand, inequality (11) implies the inequality

$$8[720 - 46\bar{d} - 8(u - \bar{g})] + 114t \leq 0$$

and, consequently, since $t \geq 0$, we should have

$$720 - 46\bar{d} - 8(u - \bar{g}) \leq 0.$$

Therefore

$$720 \leq 46\bar{d} + 8(u - \bar{g}) \leq 54\bar{d},$$

since $u - \bar{g} \leq \bar{d}$. Finally, we obtain the inequality $\bar{d} \geq \frac{720}{54}$, which contradicts the inequality $\bar{d} \leq 6$.

If $m = 9$, then it follows from inequalities (14) and (17) that $d \geq 23$ and $g - 1 \geq 15d$. Therefore, by Lemma 1, we have

$$g - 1 \geq 15(36 - \bar{d}), \quad (18)$$

$$\bar{d} \leq 28 - 23 = 5. \quad (19)$$

It follows from inequality (11) that

$$7[504 - 39\bar{d} - 8(u - \bar{g})] + 99t \leq 0,$$

or, equivalently,

$$99t \leq 273\bar{d} + 56(u - \bar{g}) - 3528. \quad (20)$$

Equality (8), in which we substitute $m = 9$, and inequality (18) imply the following inequality

$$468 - 30\bar{d} - 4(u - \bar{g}) + 9t \geq 15(36 - \bar{d}),$$

or, equivalently,

$$9t \geq 15\bar{d} + 4(u - \bar{g}) + 72. \quad (21)$$

It follows from inequalities (20) and (21) that

$$[273\bar{d} + 56(u - \bar{g}) - 3528] \geq 11[15\bar{d} + 4(u - \bar{g}) + 72],$$

that is, $4320 \leq 108\bar{d} + 12(u - \bar{g}) \leq 120\bar{d}$, since $\bar{g} \geq 0$ and $u \leq \bar{d}$. Therefore $\bar{d} \geq 36$, but this inequality contradicts inequality (19).

If $m = 8$, then it follows from inequality (14) that $g - 1 \geq 9d$. Therefore, by Lemma 1, we have

$$g - 1 \geq 9(28 - \bar{d}), \quad (22)$$

where $\bar{d} \leq 21$.

It follows from inequality (11) that

$$6[336 - 32\bar{d} - 8(u - \bar{g})] + 84t \leq 0,$$

or, equivalently,

$$7t \leq 16\bar{d} + 4(u - \bar{g}) - 168. \quad (23)$$

Equality (8), in which we substitute $m = 8$, and inequality (22) imply the following inequality

$$308 - 25\bar{d} - 4(u - \bar{g}) + 9t \geq 9(28 - \bar{d}),$$

or, equivalently,

$$9t \geq 16\bar{d} + 4(u - \bar{g}) - 56. \quad (24)$$

It follows from inequalities (23) and (24) that

$$7[16\bar{d} + 4(u - \bar{g}) - 56] \leq 9[16\bar{d} + 4(u - \bar{g}) - 168],$$

that is, $1120 \leq 32\bar{d} + 8(u - \bar{g}) \leq 40\bar{d}$, since $\bar{g} \geq 0$ and $u \leq \bar{d}$. Therefore $\bar{d} \geq 28$, which contradicts the inequality $\bar{d} \leq 21$.

If $m = 7$, then it follows from inequality (14) that $g - 1 \geq \frac{27}{5}d$. Hence we have

$$g - 1 \geq \frac{27}{5}(21 - \bar{d}), \quad (25)$$

since, by Lemma 1, $d = 21 - \bar{d}$ and $\bar{d} \leq 15$.

Inequality (11) can be written in the following form

$$69t \leq 125\bar{d} + 40(u - \bar{g}) - 1050. \quad (26)$$

Equality (8), in which we substitute $m = 7$, and inequality (25) imply the following inequality

$$189 - 20\bar{d} - 4(u - \bar{g}) + 9t \geq \frac{27}{5}(21 - \bar{d}),$$

or, equivalently,

$$45t \geq 73\bar{d} + 20(u - \bar{g}) - 378. \quad (27)$$

It follows from inequalities (26) and (27) that

$$15[125\bar{d} + 40(u - \bar{g}) - 1050] \geq 23[73\bar{d} + 20(u - \bar{g}) - 378],$$

that is, $7056 \leq 196\bar{d} + 140(u - \bar{g}) \leq 336\bar{d}$, since $\bar{g} \geq 0$ and $u \leq \bar{d}$. Therefore $\bar{d} \geq \frac{7056}{336} = 21$, which contradicts the inequality $\bar{d} \leq 15$.

If $m = 6$, then it follows from inequality (14) that $g - 1 \geq 3d$. Hence we have

$$g - 1 \geq 3(15 - \bar{d}), \quad (28)$$

since, by Lemma 1, $d = 15 - \bar{d}$ and $\bar{d} \leq 10$.

Inequality (11) can be written in the following form

$$27t \leq 36\bar{d} + 16(u - \bar{g}) - 240. \quad (29)$$

Equality (8), in which we substitute $m = 6$, and inequality (28) imply the following inequality

$$105 - 15\bar{d} - 4(u - \bar{g}) + 9t \geq 45 - 3\bar{d},$$

or, equivalently (multiplying by 3),

$$27t \geq 36\bar{d} + 12(u - \bar{g}) - 180. \quad (30)$$

It follows from inequalities (29) and (30) that

$$36\bar{d} + 16(u - \bar{g}) - 240 \geq 36\bar{d} + 12(u - \bar{g}) - 180,$$

that is, $u - \bar{g} \geq 15$. On the other hand, we have $u - \bar{g} \leq 10$, since $\bar{g} \geq 0$ and $u \leq \bar{d} \leq 10$. Contradiction. $\square$

By Theorem 2 in [6], if $\deg f \geq 8$ and S is a surface of non-general type, then Chisini's Conjecture holds for the discriminant curve B of any generic covering $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$. It is well known (see the classification of the algebraic surfaces), that if Bogomolov – Miaoka – Yau inequality does not take place for an algebraic surface S , then S is an irregular ruled surface and in this case we have $K_S^2 \leq 2e(S)$ and $K_S^2 \leq -2$. Therefore, by Lemma 2, to prove Theorem 1, it suffices to consider only the following cases: $3 \leq m \leq 7$ and if $m = 6$ or 7 , then $K_S^2 \leq 2e(S)$ and $K_S^2 \leq -2$.

Again, we assume that the invariants of the surface $\bar{S}$ satisfy inequality (11).

Case $m = 3$. In this case inequality (11) has the form

$$6 + 3\bar{d} - 8(u - \bar{g}) + 9t \leq 0.$$

It follows from inequality (7) that $\bar{d} \leq 1$ and we have two possibilities: either $\bar{d} = 0$ and, consequently, $u = \bar{g} = t = 0$, or $\bar{d} = 1$ and, consequently, $u = 1$, $\bar{g} = t = 0$, since in this case D is a line in $\mathbb{P}^3$. It is easy to see that inequality (11) does not hold in both cases.

Case $m = 4$. In this case inequality (11) has the form

$$2(24 - 4\bar{d} - 8(u - \bar{g})) + 24t \leq 0.$$

It follows from inequality (7) that $\bar{d} \leq 3$ and we have three possibilities: either $\bar{d} \leq 2$ and, consequently, $u \leq \bar{d} \leq 2$, $\bar{g} = t = 0$, or $\bar{d} = 3$, $u = 3$, $\bar{g} = 0$, $t = 1$, or $\bar{d} = 3$, $u = 1$, $t = 0$, and $\bar{g} = 1$ or 0 . It is easy to see that inequality (11) holds only in the following two cases: $u = \bar{d} = 2$, $\bar{g} = t = 0$ and $u = \bar{d} = 3$, $\bar{g} = 0$, $t = 1$. These exceptional cases will be investigated at the end of the proof of Theorem 1.

Case $m = 5$. Inequality (11) has the following form

$$3[60 - 11\bar{d} - 8(u - \bar{g})] + 39t \leq 0$$

or, equivalently,

$$60 + 2t \leq 11(\bar{d} - t) + 8(u - \bar{g}). \quad (31)$$

By Theorem 11 in [4], Chisini's Conjecture holds for the cuspidal curves B of genus $g \leq 3$. Therefore, by equality (8), we should have

$$g - 1 = 50 - 10\bar{d} - 4(u - \bar{g}) + 9t \geq 3$$

or, equivalently,

$$47 - t \geq 10(\bar{d} - t) + 4(u - \bar{g}). \quad (32)$$

By Lemma 1, we have $u \leq \bar{d} \leq 6$. Therefore $u - \bar{g} \leq 6$ and it follows from inequality (31) that

$$12 + 2t \leq 11(\bar{d} - t),$$

that is,

$$\bar{d} - t \geq 2. \quad (33)$$

Similarly, since $\bar{d} - t \leq 6$, it follows from inequality (31) that

$$-6 + 2t \leq 8(u - \bar{g})$$

and hence $u - \bar{g} \geq 0$. Applying inequality (32), we have $47 - t \geq 10(\bar{d} - t)$, that is, $\bar{d} - t \leq 4$. Therefore, by inequality (31), we obtain that $16 + 2t \leq 8(u - \bar{g})$, that is, $u - \bar{g} \geq 2$. Then, by inequality (32), we have $39 - t \geq 10(\bar{d} - t)$ and hence

$$\bar{d} - t \leq 3. \quad (34)$$

Now, it follows from inequality (31) that

$$27 + 2t \leq 8(u - \bar{g})$$

and thus $u - \bar{g} \geq 4$. Therefore $u \geq 4$ and hence $\bar{d} \geq 4$.

By inequalities (33) and (34), we have

$$2 \leq \bar{d} - t \leq 3.$$

Let us consider the case $\bar{d} - t = 3$. It follows from inequality (32) that

$$17 - t \geq 4(u - \bar{g}). \quad (35)$$

Therefore $u - \bar{g} \leq 4$. Hence $u - \bar{g} = 4$, $u = 4$, and $\bar{g} = 0$, since the genera of the irreducible components of a curve of degree $\bar{d} \leq 6$, having more than four irreducible components, should be equal to zero. In addition, it follows from inequality (35) that $t \leq 1$. Therefore $t = 1$ and $\bar{d} = 4$, since $\bar{d} - t = 3$ and $\bar{d} \geq 4$. In this case, by formulae (8), (9), and Lemma 1, the curve B should have the following invariants:

$$\deg B = 2d = 12, \quad g = 4, \quad c = 27, \quad n = (2d - 1)(d - 1) - g - c = 24.$$

But, it is impossible, since in this case, by Plücker's formula, the dual curve $\check{B}$ has degree $2d(2d-1)-3c-2n=3$ and therefore $\deg B$ should be less or equal

$$\deg \check{B}(\deg \check{B} - 1) = 3 \cdot 2 = 6.$$

Let us consider the case $\bar{d} - t = 2$. It follows from inequality (31) that

$$38 + 2t \leq 8(u - \bar{g}). \quad (36)$$

Therefore $u - \bar{g} \geq 5$. Hence $u \geq 5$ and $\bar{g} = 0$. Now, by inequality (36), we should have $u = 6$, since it follows from the equality $\bar{d} - t = 2$ and the inequalities $6 \geq \bar{d} \geq u \geq 5$ that $t \geq 3$ and hence $38 + 2t \geq 44$. Therefore we have only the following possibility:

$$u = 6, \bar{g} = 0, \bar{d} = 6, t = 4.$$

But, these values of $u, \bar{g}, \bar{d}$, and t do not satisfy inequality (32).

Case $m = 6$ and $K_S^2 \leq 2e(S)$. Applying formulae (4) and (5), we obtain the inequality

$$2c \leq 9d + 3(g - 1) - 18. \quad (37)$$

Inequality (13) can be written in the following form

$$3c \geq 4(3d + g - 1). \quad (38)$$

It follows from inequalities (38) and (37) that

$$24d + 8(g - 1) \leq 6c \leq 27d + 9(g - 1) - 54,$$

that is, $3d + g - 1 \geq 54$ and, since $d = 15 - \bar{d}$, we have

$$g - 1 \geq 54 - 3(15 - \bar{d}) = 9 + 3\bar{d}. \quad (39)$$

By assumption, the invariants of $\bar{S}$ should satisfy inequality (11), where $m = 6$, that is, they satisfy inequality (29).

Equality (8), in which we substitute $m = 6$, and inequality (39) imply the following inequality

$$105 - 15\bar{d} - 4(u - \bar{g}) + 9t \geq 9 + 3\bar{d},$$

or, equivalently,

$$27t \geq 72\bar{d} + 12(u - \bar{g}) - 288.$$

By inequality (29), we have

$$36\bar{d} + 16(u - \bar{g}) - 240 \geq 27t.$$

Therefore

$$36\bar{d} + 16(u - \bar{g}) - 240 \geq 72\bar{d} + 12(u - \bar{g}) - 288,$$

that is, $12 \geq 9\bar{d} - (u - \bar{g})$. But, $u - \bar{g} \leq \bar{d}$. Therefore $9\bar{d} - (u - \bar{g}) \geq 8\bar{d}$ and hence $3 \geq 2\bar{d}$, that is, we should have $\bar{d} \leq 1$, since $\bar{d}$ is an integer.

On the over hand, by inequality (29), we have

$$240 \leq 9\bar{d} + 27(\bar{d} - t) + 16(u - \bar{g}) \leq 52\bar{d},$$

since $\bar{d} - t \leq \bar{d}$ and $u - \bar{g} \leq \bar{d}$. Therefore we should have $\bar{d} \geq 5$. Contradiction.

Case $m = 7$ and $K_S^2 \leq 2e(S)$, $K_S^2 \leq -2$. Applying formulae (4), (5), and inequality $K_S^2 \leq 2e(S)$, we obtain the inequality

$$2c \leq 9d + 3(g - 1) - 21. \quad (40)$$

We have $K_S^2 \leq -2$. Therefore it follows from formula (2) that

$$K_S^2 = 7 \cdot 9 - 25\bar{d} - 4(u - \bar{g}) + 9t \leq -2.$$

Hence

$$65 \leq 65 + 9t \leq 25\bar{d} + 4(u - \bar{g}) \leq 29\bar{d},$$

since $t \geq 0$ and $u - \bar{g} \leq \bar{d}$. Thus, we have

$$\bar{d} \geq 3 \quad (41)$$

Inequality (13) can be written the following form

$$7c \geq 10(3d + g - 1). \quad (42)$$

It follows from inequalities (42) and (40) that

$$60d + 20(g - 1) \leq 14c \leq 63d + 21(g - 1) - 147,$$

that is,

$$3d + g - 1 \geq 147 \quad (43)$$

and, since $d = 21 - \bar{d}$, we have

$$g - 1 \geq 147 - 3(21 - \bar{d}) = 84 + 3\bar{d}. \quad (44)$$

Therefore inequality (41) implies the following inequality

$$g - 1 \geq 93. \quad (45)$$

It follows from inequalities (42) and (43) that $c \geq 210$ and, by inequality (16), we have

$$d(2d - 3) \geq c + g - 1 \geq 210 + 93 = 303$$

and hence $d \geq \frac{3+\sqrt{2433}}{4} > 13$, that is,

$$d \geq 14, \quad (46)$$

since d is an integer. Therefore

$$\bar{d} = 21 - d \leq 7. \quad (47)$$

By assumption, the invariants of $\overline{S}$ should satisfy inequality (11), where $m = 7$, that is, they satisfy inequality (26). It follows from inequality (26) that

$$210 - 25\overline{d} - 8(u - \overline{g}) \leq 0,$$

since $t \geq 0$. Therefore

$$210 \leq 25\overline{d} + 8(u - \overline{g}) \leq 33\overline{d},$$

since $u - \overline{g} \leq \overline{d}$, and hence $\overline{d} \geq \frac{210}{33} = 6 + \frac{4}{11}$, that is, $\overline{d} \geq 7$, since $\overline{d}$ is an integer. Applying inequality (47), we should have $\overline{d} = 7$.

Equality (8), in which we substitute $m = 7$, and inequality (44) imply the following inequality

$$181 - 20\overline{d} - 4(u - \overline{g}) + 9t \geq 84 + 3\overline{d}.$$

Therefore

$$9t \geq 64 + 4(u - \overline{g}), \quad (48)$$

since $\overline{d} = 7$, and by (26), we have

$$125\overline{d} + 40(u - \overline{g}) - 1050 \geq 69t,$$

that is,

$$40(u - \overline{g}) - 175 \geq 69t. \quad (49)$$

Combining inequalities (48) and (49), we obtain the inequality

$$3[40(u - \overline{g}) - 175] \geq 23[64 + 4(u - \overline{g})],$$

that is, $28(u - \overline{g}) \geq 3 \cdot 175 + 23 \cdot 64 = 1997$. But, on the other hand, $u - \overline{g} \leq \overline{d} = 7$. Contradiction.

Let us return to the last two non-investigated cases when $m = 4$ and $u = \overline{d} = 2$, $\overline{g} = t = 0$, or $u = \overline{d} = 3$, $\overline{g} = 0$, $t = 1$.

Consider the case $m = 4$ and $u = \overline{d} = 2$, $\overline{g} = t = 0$. By formulae (8), (9), and (6), we have $d = 4$, $g = 1$, and $c = 12$. Therefore the number n of nodes of B is equal to $d(2d - 3) - c - g + 1 = 8$.

Suppose that there is another generic covering $f_2 : S_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ with the same discriminant curve B which is non-equivalent to the generic projection f . Then, by Theorem 1 in [4],

$$\deg f_2 \leq \frac{4(3d + g - 1)}{2(3d + g - 1) - c} = 4.$$

Since S_2 is a non-singular surface and the discriminant curve B of f_2 has nodes, $\deg f_2$ can not be equal to 3 and hence $\deg f_2 = 4$.

Put $S_1 = S$, $R_1 = R$, $C_1 = C$, and $f_2^*(B) = 2R_2 + C_2$, where R_2 is the ramification locus of f_2 .

Consider the fibred product

$$S_1 \times_{\mathbb{P}^2} S_2 = \{ (x, y) \in S_1 \times S_2 \mid f_1(x) = f_2(y) \}$$

and let $X = \widetilde{S_1 \times_{\mathbb{P}^2} S_2}$ be the normalization of $S_1 \times_{\mathbb{P}^2} S_2$. Denote the corresponding natural morphisms by $g_1 : X \rightarrow S_1$, $g_2 : X \rightarrow S_2$, and $f_{1,2} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$. We have $\deg g_1 = \deg f_2 = 4$, $\deg g_2 = \deg f_1 = 4$, and $\deg f_{1,2} = \deg g_1 \cdot \deg f_1 = 16$. By Propositions 2 and 3 in [4], X is an irreducible non-singular surface.

Let $\tilde{R} \subset X$ be a curve $g_1^{-1}(R_1) \cap g_2^{-1}(R_2)$, $\tilde{C} = g_1^{-1}(C_1) \cap g_2^{-1}(C_2)$, $\tilde{C}_1 = g_1^{-1}(R_1) \cap g_2^{-1}(C_2)$, and $\tilde{C}_2 = g_1^{-1}(C_1) \cap g_2^{-1}(R_2)$.

By Proposition 4 in [4], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}^2 &= 2(3d + g - 1) - c = 12, \\ \tilde{C}_1^2 &= (\deg f_1 - 2)(3d + g - 1) - c = 12, \\ \tilde{C}_2^2 &= (\deg f_2 - 2)(3d + g - 1) - c = 12, \\ (\tilde{R}, \tilde{C}_i) &= c = 12 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2 \end{aligned}$$

and applying the same arguments which was used in the proof of Proposition 4 in [4], it can be easily shown that the intersection number

$$(\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2) = c + 2n = 28.$$

Therefore the determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix} \tilde{R}^2 & (\tilde{R}, \tilde{C}_1) \\ (\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{R}) & \tilde{C}_1^2 \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

and, consequently, by Hodge's Index Theorem, the classes $[\tilde{C}_1]$ and $[\tilde{R}]$ of the curves $\tilde{C}_1$ and $\tilde{R}$ in the Neron – Severi group $\text{NS}(X)$ of the divisors on X up to numerical equivalence are linear dependent. Since $\tilde{R}^2 = \tilde{C}_1^2$, then $[\tilde{R}] = [\tilde{C}_1]$ in $\text{NS}(X)$. Applying the same arguments, we obtain that $[\tilde{R}] = [\tilde{C}_2]$ and hence $[\tilde{C}_2] = [\tilde{C}_1]$ in $\text{NS}(X)$. Therefore the intersection number $(\tilde{C}_2, \tilde{C}_1)$ must be equal to $\tilde{C}_1^2 = 12$. On the other hand, $(\tilde{C}_2, \tilde{C}_1) = 28$. Contradiction.

To complete the proof of Theorem 1, note that the last case when $m = 4$, $u = \bar{d} = 3$, $\bar{g} = 0$, $t = 1$ corresponds to a generic projection $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$, where $S \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$ is embedded in $\mathbb{P}^5$ by the polynomials of degree two (the Veronese embedding of $\mathbb{P}^2$ in $\mathbb{P}^5$) and f is the restriction to S of a linear projection $\text{pr} : \mathbb{P}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ (see, for example, [3]). In this case, $B \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ is the dual curve of a smooth cubic, $\deg B = 6$, $c = 9$, and B is the discriminant curve of four non-equivalent generic coverings of $\mathbb{P}^2$ ([2], [1]). Three of them have degree four, and the last one has degree three. $\square$

Corollary 1. *Let S_i be non-singular surfaces, $i = 1, 2$, and $S_i \subset \mathbb{P}^{N_i}$ two embeddings given by complete linear systems of divisors on S_i . Suppose that these embeddings do not coincide with the Veronese embedding of $\mathbb{P}^2$ in $\mathbb{P}^5$. Let $f_i = pr_{i|S_i} : S_i \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be two generic coverings ramified over the same cuspidal curve B , where $pr_i : \mathbb{P}^{N_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ are linear projections. Then $N_1 = N_2 = N$ and there is a linear transformation $h : \mathbb{P}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ such that $h(S_1) = S_2$ and $f_1 = f_2 \circ h$.*

Proof. Denote by $\bar{L}_i = f_i^{-1}(L) \subset S_i$, $i = 1, 2$, the proper transform of a line L in $\mathbb{P}^2$. By Theorem 1, there is an isomorphism $h : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$ such that $f_1 = h \circ f_2$. Therefore $h(\bar{L}_1) = \bar{L}_2$ and hence $h^*(\mathcal{O}_{S_2}(\bar{L}_2)) = \mathcal{O}_{S_1}(\bar{L}_1)$. Consequently, we have

$$N_1 = \dim H^0(S_1, \mathcal{O}_{S_1}(\bar{L}_1)) = \dim H^0(S_2, \mathcal{O}_{S_2}(\bar{L}_2)) = N_2$$

and the isomorphism h can be defined by a linear transformation $\mathbb{P}^{N_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_2}$ induced by $h^* : H^0(S_2, \mathcal{O}_{S_2}(\bar{L}_2)) \rightarrow H^0(S_1, \mathcal{O}_{S_1}(\bar{L}_1))$. $\square$

Note also that if $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ is a generic covering, $\deg f = 4$, branched over a cuspidal curve $B \subset \mathbb{P}^2$, $\deg B = 6$, $c = 9$, then, by (4) and (5), we have $K_S^2 = 9$ and $e(S) = 3$. By Hurwitz formula, the genus of $f^{-1}(L)$, where L is a line in $\mathbb{P}^2$, is equal to $\frac{-2 \deg f + (L, B)}{2} + 1 = 0$. Therefore $S \simeq \mathbb{P}^2$ and f is given by polynomials of degree 2. Hence, in the exceptional case of a cuspidal curve $B \subset \mathbb{P}^2$, $\deg B = 6$, $c = 9$, each of three non-equivalent generic coverings f_i , $\deg f_i = 4$, ramified over B , are generic projections of $\mathbb{P}^2$ embedded in $\mathbb{P}^5$ by Veronese embeddings. It is easy to see that the fourth exceptional generic covering $f_4 : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$, $\deg f_4 = 3$, is not a generic projection (see Case $m = 3$ in the proof of Theorem 1). Therefore we have the following

Corollary 2. *Let $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be a generic linear projection branched over a cuspidal curve $B \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. Then S is determined uniquely (up to isomorphism) by the curve B .*

REFERENCES

- [1] Catanese F., *On a Problem of Chisini*. Duke Math. J., **53**, No. 1 (1986), 33-42.
- [2] Chisini O., *Sulla identita birazionale delle funzioni algebriche di due variabili dotate di una medesima curva di diramazione*. Rend. Ins. Lombardo, **77**, (1944), 339-356.
- [3] Griffiths P. and Harris J., *Principles of algebraic geometry*. A Wiley-Interscience Publication, John Wiley & Sons, New York Chichester Brisbane Toronto, 1978.
- [4] Kulikov Vik.S., *On Chisini's Conjecture*. Izv. Math., **63:6**, (1999), 1139-1170.

- [5] Moishezon B., *Complex surfaces and connected sums of complex projective planes*. LNM, **603**, (1977), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York.
- [6] Nemirovski S., *On Kulikov's theorem on the Chisini Conjecture*. Izv. Math., **65:1**, (2001), 71-74.

STEKLOV MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, GUBKINA STR., 8, 119991 MOSCOW,
RUSSIA

E-mail address: kulikov@mi.ras.ru